LB
2341
B8

UC-NRLF

$B 17 458

BURTON

LB 2341 B8

YC 04114

GIFT
DEC 20 1916

Confidential
report

ASPECTS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

A REPORT TO THE

TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

BY

HARRY EDWIN BURTON, Ph.D.,

Daniel Webster Professor of the Latin Language and Literature

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

PUBLISHED BY THE COLLEGE
HANOVER, N. H.
1916

LB2341
B8

gift of Ernest M. Hopkins
Pres. of Dartmouth

UNIV OF
CALIFORNIA

DARTMOVTH COLLEGE

HANOVER, N. H.

Offices of Administration

THE PRESIDENT

CALIFORNIA

ASPECTS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

To the Trustees of Dartmouth College:—

Gentlemen:

I have the honor to submit a report of conditions in various colleges and universities, based upon an investigation undertaken at your invitation during the second semester of the year 1915-1916. Between February 1 and June 1, I visited the following institutions in the order given: Yale University, Columbia University, Princeton University, Western Reserve University, the Ohio State University, Oberlin College, the University of Michigan, the University of Chicago, the University of Denver, the University of Colorado, Colorado College, Occidental College, Pomona College, the University of California, Stanford University, Reed College, the University of Washington, the University of Minnesota, the University of Wisconsin, Williams College, Amherst College.

In the early part of the year 1916-1917 I made a supplementary trip, visiting Brown University and Harvard University. Everywhere administrative officers and members of faculties were courteous and hospitable and discussed conditions in their institutions with perfect frankness. I was particularly glad to meet in other universities and colleges many who had been students or teachers at Dartmouth and who were therefore in a position to make comparisons.

I realize that my report is by no means exhaustive. There are many other institutions which I should have been glad to visit, had there been time. It will of course be understood when I make general statements that I am referring only to those colleges and universities which are included in this report. I realize also that many subjects treated might be of interest to the faculty rather than to the trustees, but it has seemed best to include in one report all the matters which I have had opportunity to investigate.

I. Trustees

Boards of trustees or regents show a wide variation in numbers, those of the endowed institutions being in general much larger than those of the state universities. Ohio State, for example, has only six members on its board, the University of Colorado seven, while Pomona has 29, Princeton 30, and Brown 47 (including fellows and trustees). Dartmouth with only twelve, has a smaller

344202

board than any of the other endowed institutions, with the exception of Harvard, whose governing board—called the corporation—consists of the president and six fellows. Harvard, however, has, in addition to the corporation, a board of overseers of 30 members, elected from and by the alumni, whose approval is necessary in the case of all important appointments and statutes or standing votes affecting the general policies of the university.

Alumni representation on the governing board (that is, the election of members by the alumni) is the rule in endowed institutions, at least in the east and in the middle states. Dartmouth, with five alumni trustees, has a larger proportion of alumni representation than any other, unless we may regard the Harvard board of overseers as an integral part of the governing board. Williams has five in a total of sixteen; Amherst five in a total of seventeen; Yale six in a total of sixteen; Oberlin six in a total of twenty-four; Princeton five in a total of thirty. Among the eastern institutions Brown is peculiar in that some of its trustees are not graduates of the university.

The boards of regents of the state universities are either appointed by the governor of the state or are elected by popular vote, and in general there is no effort to secure the services of graduates of the institution, a situation that is somewhat surprising to an eastern college man. The University of Colorado has not a single alumnus on its board. Michigan is the only exception; the eight members are usually graduates of the university. The damage that may be done by a non-graduate or non-academic board is illustrated by a recent experience of the University of Washington, when an attempt was made to secure the appointment of regents who would change the lease of certain university property, to the detriment of the university and the profit of various individuals. The attempt was foiled only by great activity on the part of the alumni. At the University of Minnesota they rather pride themselves on the fact that politics do not enter into the selection of the regents, who are appointed by the governor; and I was interested in the significance of a remark of an officer of the university, who, speaking of the regents, said: "They don't interfere with the university very much."

There is great variety in the attitude of boards of trustees or regents toward their institutions, especially in the powers delegated to faculties. There is, I think, a growing tendency all over the country to increase the administrative powers of the faculty. At Oberlin, where this has gone further than anywhere else, the trustees appear to have only two functions; they manage investments and they adopt, as a matter of form, the recommendations of the faculty. The faculty is practically the board of control; it discusses and recommends even the expenditure of money and the erection of new buildings; and, although salaries are low—they are virtually fixed by the faculty itself—I must admit that I found nowhere a more contented or more interested faculty than that at

Oberlin, except, possibly, at Yale, which, in certain aspects of faculty control, must be placed close to Oberlin.

The growing tendency of trustees to delegate administrative functions to the faculty is manifested chiefly in two ways,—first, in the matter of appointments to the teaching body, of which I shall speak later, and secondly in the creation of joint committees of trustees and faculty. At Amherst and Pomona there are committees of this sort having charge of grounds and buildings. At Wisconsin there is an annual meeting of the regents and a committee of the faculty, but the functions of the joint meeting are not definite and nothing of importance seems to have been accomplished. At Princeton, a conference committee, consisting of a committee of the trustees and a committee of the faculty, was created last year and has at least the possibility of becoming an active and useful element in the administration of the university. One of its functions is the recommendation to the trustees of candidates for honorary degrees, at the suggestion of the various departments. The trustees last year adopted a recommendation of this committee that members of the faculty should not be permitted to do tutoring during term time.

At Yale there is no joint committee, but the permanent officers of the university lunch with the members of the corporation once each term, and there are faculty representatives on certain committees of the corporation. Moreover, the university council, composed of the administrative officers of the university and representatives of the faculties, acts as a sort of advisory board for the corporation. At Oberlin the prudential committee, which acts for the trustees in almost all matters, is composed of the president, two resident trustees, the deans, the treasurer, the secretary, and the superintendent of buildings. At Reed there is a similar committee, the welfare committee, consisting of the president, two trustees, and two members of the faculty elected by the faculty.

It must be confessed that, except at Oberlin and Reed, the idea of joint deliberations of trustees and faculty is still in its infancy. We are still far from adopting the plan convincingly advocated by President Schurman and others of having faculty representatives on the board of trustees. As a beginning, however, I have been favorably impressed with the possibilities of this scheme of joint committees, not only as a means of giving to the trustees valuable information, but as tending to develop in the faculty an increased sense of responsibility and loyalty.

II. The Budget

In most institutions the budget is prepared by the trustees or by a committee of the trustees without previous discussion or recommendation on the part of the faculty or a committee of the faculty. The only exceptions I have noted are Oberlin, where the

budget is prepared by the faculty and is submitted to the trustees for their approval; Minnesota, where it is first considered by a faculty committee called the advisory committee; and Reed, where all proposed recommendations of the president relating to the budget are first submitted to a faculty council of eight members; unless five agree, the matter goes to a small joint committee of trustees and faculty.

In other institutions department heads are usually consulted regarding the needs of their departments. At Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Wisconsin, Michigan, and California, each department head in consultation with his department prepares a budget, and, in most of these institutions, the department budgets pass through the hands of the dean before reaching the president.

In most of the smaller institutions the process is quite informal—a personal interview of the president with the department head. At Williams, on the other hand, each department head is required to submit at the end of each year a report of the work of his department, which is afterward printed, and at the same time a budget for his department for the following year. This report of the work of departments at Williams is, so far as I know, unique, except as such material is included in the reports of presidents and deans.

III. The President

It may not be improper to record some impressions regarding college presidents. The position of the president and his activities are usually determined rather by his disposition than by law or tradition. I was interested in the statement of several presidents that the president should regard himself rather as a member of the faculty than as a member of the board of trustees. As a matter of fact, in several institutions, for example the Case School in Cleveland, the University of Michigan, and Leland Stanford, he is not a member of the board. In some institutions the president's powers have been restricted by delegating certain functions to the faculty, especially the recommendation of new members of the faculty. At Stanford the president must consult the advisory board of the faculty regarding all important executive acts. At Colorado College an interesting experiment has been put into operation on the resignation of President Slocum. The faculty nominated six members from whom the trustees have chosen three, who will perform all administrative functions hitherto belonging to the president, at least until the election of a new president.

Speaking broadly, there are two types of college presidents—the autocratic and the non-autocratic. The autocratic president believes in complete centralized power and more or less frankly runs the institution. He appoints all committees, is himself a mem-

ber of several, and dominates the committees of which he is a member. I find that a president of this type is subject to the private criticism of members of his faculty; in faculty meeting he may be violently attacked or, on the other hand, the meeting may exhibit only a peaceful acquiescence in matters which are known to be foregone conclusions. The autocratic president may administer his institution with great success, but the non-autocratic president, or the one who at least does not openly exercise despotic power, finds a better disposition in his faculty,—a spirit of content, a greater interest, a feeling of personal responsibility for the affairs of the institution.

Incidentally I may say that I found almost no college or university in which the president does not publish an annual report. In many cases this is accompanied by a report of the dean or deans and other officials. This seems to me an exceedingly valuable thing, not only as offering information to alumni and others, but as crystalizing certain problems for the consideration of trustees or faculty.

IV. The Dean

The duties and powers of college deans are more or less extensive in the various institutions, but, speaking generally, deans appear to be the busiest of all college officers. The amount of work done by some of them is prodigious. For example, Dean Jones at Yale, in addition to the routine work of the office, presides in faculty meetings, appoints all committees, and, in consultation with the president, determines the amount of salaries; he has a special committee appointed by himself which he consults on important matters. Dean Leutner at Western Reserve appoints all committees, is a member of several, and does most of the work of the committees of which he is a member; he appoints the advisors and practically controls the matter of discipline for low scholarship.

In the smaller institutions and, in fact, in some of the larger ones, the dean carries one or more courses. It seems to be a prevailing opinion that every dean should do some teaching. At Wisconsin and Minnesota the dean prepares the budget.

At some of the universities,—for example, Harvard, Princeton, Chicago, and California,—there is a dean of the faculty, a sort of vice-president, with none of the functions usually assigned to a dean. At Chicago there are twelve deans, not including those of the professional schools; five of these are deans of the so-called junior colleges, their functions being those of class-officers or advisors.

V. The Faculty

Appointment, Promotion and Dismissal

In many of the institutions visited there is some method of faculty recommendation in the matter of appointment, promotion, and dismissal, of officers of instruction. In some the whole faculty of permanent officers makes recommendations to the trustees; in others the work is done by a committee of the faculty. At Yale the first system appears in its most developed form. In the case of a candidate for an instructorship or the first term of an assistant professorship, the department concerned recommends directly to the faculty; in the case of a candidate for a professorship or the second term of an assistant professorship (that is, a position that may be regarded as permanent), the dean appoints a committee (partly from the department concerned, partly from related departments, and partly from unrelated departments); this committee considers candidates and makes recommendations to the governing board of the faculty, which consists of all the full professors. It is said that both the committees and the faculty consider candidates with the greatest care, and that it is not uncommon for the faculty to reject candidates recommended by the committees. The recommendations of the faculty are practically always adopted by the corporation.

The Yale faculty is enthusiastic regarding its appointment system. Dean Jones, for example, says that a group knows more than any one man; that the system creates *esprit de corps* and a sense of responsibility. It is claimed also that it stimulates the interest of departments in one another. On the other hand, several prominent officers of other institutions made the identical criticism that the Yale faculty is mediocre and that its mediocrity is due to the method of appointment; that it tends to keep out a man not socially attractive. To me personally, laying aside the question of mediocrity, the explanation was not convincing. I do not believe that the Yale faculty is in any large degree influenced by the social qualities of candidates. A counter claim might be made to the effect that Yale is conspicuously well equipped with good teachers, that personal qualities are important in the teacher, if not in the investigator, and that the Yale system allows a consideration of personal qualities which would hardly be possible under a one-man appointment system.

At Western Reserve and at Oberlin the system is similar to that at Yale. At Western Reserve the committee for preliminary consideration of candidates consists of members of the department concerned and of related departments. The faculty (that is, the full professors) in the year 1913-1914 held thirteen meetings for the consideration of candidates. At Oberlin the president is usually a member of the appointment committee. The faculty,—that is, the permanent officers, called the council,—recommends to the

prudential committee, the joint committee before mentioned. This committee usually takes final action, without reference to the whole board of trustees. In both institutions the president and the members of the faculty are enthusiastic advocates of the system.

At Stanford, Reed, Minnesota, and Washington, recommendation is made by a committee, without reference to the faculty. At Stanford there is an advisory board of nine professors, and no appointment is recommended to the trustees without the approval of this board. The president; though not a member of the board, has the initiative in the matter of appointment and no recommendations originate in the board itself. I may quote from the report of the committee of trustees which recommended this method of appointment:—"Public spirit dies where we are debarred from public action; professors are interested in their departments, but nobody except the president considers officially the whole university or particpates officially in its control."

At Reed the president makes recommendation to a faculty council of eight members. Unless five agree, the matter is referred to a joint committee consisting of the president, two trustees, and two members of the faculty. President Foster believes this to be the ideal system. In *School and Society* for April 22, 1916, he states its advantages for president, trustees, and faculty. His argument is convincing and the whole article, under the title "Faculty Participation in College Government," is most illuminating.

At Minnesota a committee of the faculty discusses appointments, promotions, and dismissals and makes recommendations, through the dean, to the board of regents. The recommendations are always adopted and President Vincent regards the system as a great help to the president. In several cases dismissal has been recommended by this committee.

At the University of Washington the faculty have no responsibility for appointments, but in the matter of promotions there is an interesting svstem. Every teacher is considered for promotion at the end of a five-year term; if it is a question of promotion from an associate professorship to a full professorship, all the professors consider the case; if from an assistant professorship to an associate professorship, all the professors of the group of related departments; if from an instructorship to an assistant professorship, the members of the department only. If a teacher is not promoted at the end of a five-year term, he may be considered at any time thereafter.

In other institutions visited the system is less definite. At Michigan the president sometimes appoints a committee of the faculty to consider the appointment of a full professor. It is perhaps significant of the feeling in institutions of this type that at Michigan faculty meetings are rarely held and that few men take any interest in the university outside of their own departments.

At California the president may, if he wishes, consult a committee of heads of related departments regarding a contemplated appointment. It may be said that some members of the California faculty are critical of existing conditions and strongly in favor of greater faculty powers. The claim is made that the dignity of a faculty is maintained only if it has administrative functions. It is true at least that faculty meetings at California have a meagre attendance and there is apparently little interest in the administration or condition of the university. At the other institutions visited appointments and promotions are made on the recommendation of the president, in consultation with the heads of the departments concerned. At some of these places, however, there is much talk of the desirability of increased faculty power.

I have myself been convinced, not only by the arguments in favor of faculty recommendation but also by conditions in those institutions where it is in operation, that it is highly beneficial for a faculty either as a whole, or through a committee, to have the power of recommendation in these matters. Between the two general methods, in spite of the apparent success of the former at Yale, Western Reserve, and Oberlin, I am in favor of the delegation of this power to a large committee, without reference to the faculty. There is, I think, less danger of political manipulation. Moreover, many members of so large a body as a faculty must inevitably fail to give much personal consideration to matters under discussion; their feeling of responsibility would be slight and their votes would depend in some degree upon the persuasiveness of speakers.

Committees of the Faculty

In addition to the ordinary committees which are found in one form or another in most colleges there are some of a more or less unusual nature which are worth noting.

At Chicago a special committee was appointed last year whose function is to standardize the quality and quantity of work required in the various courses. This committee will consider the amount of time required for preparation and the nature of examinations; it will question good students who have taken the courses in recent years as to the preparation required and the value of the courses. The Chicago faculty is sceptical of the ability of the committee to get the needed information and in general is not hopeful of results.

The College of Science, Literature, and the Arts at Minnesota has only two committees,—the advisory committee and the administrative board. The advisory committee is selected by the president and dean from a list of nominations of the faculty; but those having the most votes are invariably chosen. This committee has no powers; it is strictly advisory. Among other things it recommends appointments, promotions, dismissals, and salaries. There is a similar committee at Stanford. The administrative

board is composed of the assistant dean (chairman), the dean, the dean of women, the dean of the School of Education, and two members chosen by the faculty. It has wide functions, including admission, and discipline for low scholarship. The members carry only about half of the regular amount of teaching. There is also at Minnesota a university committee of five members on intramural sports,—the only faculty committee of this sort that I have found.

The two important committees at Reed have already been mentioned. The council is composed of the president and eight members elected by the faculty. All proposed recommendations of the president to the trustees relating to appointments, promotions, dismissals, salaries, and budget must be presented to the council. In case five members are in opposition, the matter is submitted to the welfare committee, which consists of the president, two trustees, and two members of the faculty, elected by the faculty.

At California the welfare committee considers the personal welfare of the faculty as a whole, or of individual members. The chairman is an emeritus professor. The committee is self-perpetuating. It has several times appealed successfully to the regents on behalf of a member of the faculty in distress on account of illness or debt; and on other occasions has saved members of the faculty who were in danger of losing their positions and ruining their academic careers. It induced the regents to appropriate a considerable sum of money for the faculty club.

Class-Officers and Advisors

Class-officers are found in only a few places and those, with two exceptions, small institutions. They are Yale, Amherst, Colorado College, Occidental, Pomona, and Chicago. At Yale the class-officer is a kind of assistant dean; he presides in the class faculty meeting, an administrative device that was abandoned some years ago at Dartmouth. He has, with the students of his class, only such relations as may be formed in a dean's office. At Amherst the class-officers have a similar function and constitute the administration committee. At Occidental and Pomona the class-officers are the only advisors, but their relation with students is academic rather than personal. At Chicago there are five deans for the freshman and sophomore classes; they are practically class-officers or advisors under another name.

Advisory systems are found nearly everywhere, and this matter has in the past few years been given so much attention in the college world that I shall treat it in some detail, giving the systems found in the various institutions and the criticisms of those who are familiar with their operation.

At Yale the advisors—called division officers—are appointed by the class-officers. Each looks after from 20 to 35 students, freshmen and sophomores, but it is admitted that they do little for

sophomores. Registrar Merritt says that the system is of little use; that it is unwise to give too much advice to students and, in any case, they do not want it. As usual, a few of the advisors accomplish something, but Dean Jones says the system is not worth the trouble. The relation is largely official and disciplinary; it rarely becomes personal. The members of the faculty with whom I talked agreed unanimously with the views expressed by the administrative officers.

At Amherst there are advisors for all classes, but the advisory relation is frankly not intended to be a personal one; it seems to involve little more than approval of elective cards. At Williams all freshman instructors are utilized as advisors, but the system is not well organized. In 1915-1916 assignments were not made until Christmas. Students rarely see their advisors and the system is said to be more or less of a farce. Dean Ferry believes that no advisory system is good for anything.

The system at Columbia was established with the idea that the advisor would become the personal friend of his students. But the relationship has in most cases became purely academic, chiefly for the approval of elections. Each advisor has from ten to fifteen students. Professor Jones, director of admissions, thinks it a good thing for freshmen, but others regard it as of very little value.

At Princeton the freshman class is divided into twenty sections and each has an advisor. There are no advisors beyond freshman year. Registrar Jones believes the system entirely artificial and ineffective, and tells a story of sending a student to his advisor who telephoned the registrar to ask why the student was sent to him, as he had never seen him before. The few advisors who are of any use, he says, would give advice to a group of students anyway. Dean McClenahan, who has charge of the system, thinks it works well in some cases; and that at least it makes a good impression on parents. But he admits that he has put in some seniors as advisors, that they are much better, and that he hopes ultimately to use seniors altogether. With one exception the members of the faculty with whom I talked regarded the faculty advisory system as nearly or quite useless.

At Western Reserve there is the anomaly of advisors for upperclassmen and none for freshmen. The dean makes the appointments and says the system is of little use. There is no personal relation. When a student has selected his major study, a member of that department becomes his advisor. At Ohio State there was once a system, but it fell into disuse, and now the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. appoint senior advisors. At Oberlin the dean is the only advisor of freshmen. At the end of freshman year each student selects an advisor for the rest of his course. At the beginning of junior year he chooses his major and the head of the department becomes a second advisor. Both sign the elective cards. There is no personal relation.

At Michigan various systems have been tried, but in the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts all have been discarded. Now the women have appointed juniors as advisors, and the plan is working well; the men are considering a similar system. The School of Engineering has one of the few successful faculty advisory systems I have found. Each instructor (called a "mentor") has ten students (called "mentees") and retains the same ones throughout the course. The relation is personal as well as academic, and the system is said to be working very well.

At Chicago the advisory system has been abandoned. The deans and the heads of departments in which students take their majors act as advisors. The women have student advisors assigned by the Y. W. C. A. At Wisconsin the dean assigns freshmen, in varying numbers, to members of the faculty. At the beginning of junior year the student comes under the supervision of a member of his major department. There is no attempt at a personal relation. Members of the faculty differ as to the value of the system.

Faculty advisors are still appointed at Minnesota for freshmen and sophomores, though the president, the assistant dean, who makes the assignments, and many members of the faculty agree that the system is a dead letter and that the advisors are useless. As a matter of fact, though still appointed, they have been superseded in their activities by senior advisors for both men and women, and the assistant dean is enthusiastic about their work. On registration day the student council has a group of students at hand to help freshmen. Each freshman is at that time assigned to a senior and urged to go to him at once.

At the University of Colorado each advisor has about fourteen students. The relation is academic and Dean Hellems is doubtful of its value. At Colorado College practically all members of the faculty are advisors for freshmen and sophomores; each has about eight. The relation is supposed to be personal, but there is a general agreement in the faculty that it works out in that way in only a few cases.

Until this year the University of California had a unique arrangement. Forty or fifty members of the faculty were appointed advisors by the dean of the lower college. The relation between advisor and students was supposed to be personal, and each advisor was paid $100 a year for the purposes of entertainment. But in spite of this generosity the system was a failure and was abandoned. Dean Putnam reports the result of an investigation as follows:— "It was clear that the relationship of freshman and advisor was regarded by a large portion of the student body as perfunctory and artificial and that much of the effort of the advisors, though conscientiously given, was on this account being wasted. While no doubt some freshmen have been very decidedly benefited by the acquaintanceship with their faculty advisors, I am convinced that this system cannot be made wholly successful unless a more natural

relationship between student and advisor can be found." (*President's Report, 1914-1915, p. 158*) Two hundred seniors have been appointed as advisors, and in the latter part of a student's course he comes under the care of an instructor in his major department.

At Stanford the only advisor is a graduate student, who is a member of the student council and acts as advisor for the whole university.

At Reed students select their advisors. At the time of registration they are required to visit all their instructors and choose one as advisor. An instructor may have none or as many as twenty students. In later years most students have as advisor an instructor in their major subject. A personal relation is often established and the system is said to work very well.

The function of the advisor at the University of Washington is usually limited to a scrutiny of the elective card. At the beginning of junior year the student comes under the charge of the head of his major department. The relation in both cases is academic. For personal advice there are a dean of men and a dean of women, who are responsible for the life of the dormitories and the fraternity and sorority houses, and are constantly consulted by individuals.

The Brown system is similar to that at Dartmouth. Service on the advisory board is voluntary and each advisor has from five to seven students, all freshmen, though the relation—a personal one as at Dartmouth—sometimes continues through the four years. Some members of the faculty believe that the system justifies its existence, though one man admitted that he never sees most of his students after their first call; and another estimated that only one out of ten gets any help from it. The Brown system is supplemented by a series of lectures to freshmen on the opportunities offered by the university, methods of work in lecture-room and laboratory, college life, etc.

At Harvard there was, until recently, an advisory system for freshmen only, with twenty to twenty-five students assigned to each member of the board. This proved to be unsuccessful, as was also the use of seniors as advisors. Now service is compulsory except in the case of members of the faculty who are excused. Four or five freshmen are assigned to each advisor; he is supposed to act as their advisor throughout their course, and he has a hold on them from the fact that he must sign their elective cards. One man told me that he knew all his students intimately; another, that he maintained a connection with about half, but that there were many members of the faculty who believed that the system was not worth the trouble.

I may mention here an interesting device recently put into operation at Harvard,—the scholarship service bureau, organized by Phi Beta Kappa. An executive committee of members of the society has associated with itself a group of students of high rank

who are willing to give assistance—advice, not instruction—without payment. The committee keeps an office-hour and assigns to a member of the group each student who makes application. It is not a tutoring bureau. The student advisor helps the other in the selection of his courses and makes suggestions regarding methods of study, the taking of notes, etc. The system is regarded as beneficial for both parties.

It is apparent that, nearly everywhere, faculty advisory systems have been a more or less complete failure. Where no personal relation is sought, the consensus of opinion regards the system as not worth the trouble; in the few institutions that have undertaken to establish a personal relation, it is agreed that the relation is artificial and that the system is a farce. It is astonishing that so many retain a system which they frankly admit to be practically useless.

At Dartmouth we have carried the advisory idea rather further than any other college. In fact, we have a double system, that of class-officers and faculty advisors. The advisors are supposed to be the personal friends of their students; otherwise they have no reason for existence, as they do not even sign elective cards, the only function of faculty advisors in many places. If we are maintaining this system successfully, we are doing a thing that few institutions have been able to accomplish. Personally I am somewhat sceptical and I should be interested in the results of an investigation, undertaken preferably by the dean.

Except at Harvard the senior advisory system has been successful wherever it has been tried, but in none of these places, I think, are fraternity conditions just what they are at Dartmouth, and I should be doubtful of its success here. As a matter of fact we do not need a substitute for faculty advisors. We have a system already established,—the class-officers.

Our freshman and sophomore class-officers in the last few years have been not mere college officials but real advisors. We have actually tried out two systems side by side and, to my mind, the class-officers have undoubtedly won. If I had not seen the failure of faculty advisory systems in so many places, I should have been inclined to regard the activity of the class-officers as responsible for the very doubtful success of our advisory system. As it is, I believe we should simply congratulate ourselves upon having already in operation a better system. The amount of teaching of the freshman and sophomore class-officers should probably be reduced. It is possible that there should be two freshman class-officers, like the deans of the junior colleges at Chicago, who would divide the class between them. But in one form or another I believe the class-officer system is the solution of the advisory problem.

Nearly all the institutions visited have, like Dartmouth, adopted, with variations, the letter system of marking. Harvard, Brown, Williams, Columbia, Chicago, Michigan, Minnesota, Stanford, and Washington, like Dartmouth, have only four passing grades, A, B, C, and D. California has the same system, though it uses numbers instead of letters. At Brown sixty percent is regarded as the passing mark, and the letters represent, definitely, ten points each. In view of the criticism that our system of only four passing grades does not give opportunity for necessary distinctions, it is interesting to note that Princeton, Western Reserve, Ohio State, Oberlin, and Occidental have five passing grades and Pomona six; that Occidental had only four, but found it necessary to add a fifth; that, while Chicago has only four passing grades, it recognizes A—, B—, and C— as official marks, making seven in all; moreover E does not represent a failure, but a condition, with the privilege of a second examination. At Williams many of the faculty deplore the change from percentages to letters; they continue to hand in plus and minus marks, though these are not recorded at the office. They claim that proper discrimination is impossible and emphasize the difficulty of awarding prizes.

Amherst, Wisconsin, and Colorado College retain the percentage system and the University of Colorado has gone back from the letter system to percentages. Reed has a numerical system, one to ten, with eight passing marks, and Yale has a system all its own, with marks ranging from zero to 400. It is evident that Dartmouth has gone as far as any other college in the matter or reducing the number of grades.

Some institutions have a point system like that at Dartmouth, an A mark carrying more points than B, B more than C, etc., with the requirement of a minimum number of points for graduation. Others content themselves with a limitation of the number of low marks accepted for credit. At Columbia, for example, not more than one D is counted toward a degree in any one semester. At Western Reserve the mark must be F, or better, (the marks are E, G, F, P, D, X) in at least thirty three-hour courses. At Chicago the student must have an average not lower than C. At Amherst he must have an average of at least seventy per cent.

Nearly everywhere outside of New England there are two grades of failure,—a deficiency with the privilege of a second examination, and complete failure. Even Princeton retains this element of weakness. At Oberlin there is a unique but quite logical arrangement: a student marked deficient (E) may take a second examination unless he is a senior in the second semester. In that case he must repeat the course in the summer session or the following year.

Under certain circumstances a student may be exempt from examinations:—at Yale, if he has honor grade (but the instructor

may use his discretion); at Chicago, seniors of high rank; at Minnesota, seniors with no failures since freshman year and in good standing in their courses.

Discipline for Low Scholarship

With a few exceptions Dartmouth is, in this matter, more severe and more automatic than the other institutions I have visited. Amherst, Williams, Princeton, Pomona and, possibly, Minnesota and Chicago may be grouped with Dartmouth in the more or less drastic elimination of deficient students. In the central states and in the west it is generally agreed that the certificate system of admission allows many students to enter college who at least for several months find college work exceedingly difficult; and it is the general attitude of college administrators that such students should be treated with leniency. In this, as in other college relations, the individual receives more consideration in the west than in most of the eastern colleges.

It is understood, of course, that statements based upon comparative grades are not necessarily conclusive. Sixty per cent, or a D grade, in one institution may mean something quite different from what it means in another.

At Amherst discipline for low scholarship is more severe than at Dartmouth, though perhaps not so automatic,—that is, there is more consideration of the individual. A student making, in any semester, less than fifty per cent in two subjects or less than sixty per cent in three is separated. A student making less than fifty per cent in a subject in the first semester is not allowed to continue it in the second and loses his privilege of absences.

At Pomona a student who falls below an average of C, or has a complete failure in two or more courses, is automatically separated. I may say incidentally that Pomona has a very high reputation on the Pacific coast. California and Stanford rate her graduates among the best of their graduate students.

At Williams and Princeton, as at Dartmouth, a student must pass three-fifths of his work to remain in college. At Princeton from 80 to 100 students are separated every year. Each of these has the privilege of appearing before the committee, and a freshman may bring an upperclassman as an advocate. But Dean McClenahan says that the rule operates practically without exception. At Minnesota discipline is severe, but it is administered with great care. President Vincent is strongly opposed to the automatic treatment of students for low scholarship, absences, etc. Many are very poorly prepared, but they are weeded out rapidly in freshman year. Marks are reported every month and students are separated at any time, even during the first semester of freshman year. The system provides for personal interviews and no one is separated without previous warning.

At Chicago a student whose average is below D may be separated at the end of the first or second quarter. After that, a student is separated at any time when his grade points fall ten below the standard, an allowance of two for each full course. It is said that the automatic application of this rule has had a most beneficial effect.

Other institutions show great variety in severity and in the consideration of individual conditions, but, in general, as compared with Dartmouth, they are more or less lax, or they carry individual treatment so far that it is impossible to discover any definite principle of discipline. In Yale College in 1914-1915 only twenty-five were separated for low scholarship, and that is said to have been a rather larger number than usual. Freshmen are usually separated for failures in three courses, but every case is considered individually. Action originates in the class faculty; from that it goes to the dean and class-officer; and then to the college faculty. After freshman year very few are separated:—only one in 1914-1915. The Yale system is regarded elsewhere as over-lenient.

At Columbia about twelve freshmen are separated each year. Members of the faculty explain that it is unnecessary to send students away, as they may make up their deficiencies in the extension courses.

At Ohio State a student is supposed to be separated if he fails more than half his work; but in practice he is allowed to remain on probation through another semester. In the central states it is the general custom to allow students to remain through the year. At Oberlin, if a student in the first semester passes one-third of his work, he may continue, but must pass all his courses in the second semester. At Michigan there is no fixed rule. Dean Effinger believes that each case should be treated individually. At Wisconsin there is no rule and it appears that anyone who is separated may apply for immediate readmission. The Colorado institutions are notably lax. The Chancellor of the University of Denver frankly admits that no one is sent away for low scholarship, though a student may be deprived of one course and put under the special charge of a member of the faculty. At the University of Colorado there is a rule that freshmen must pass eight hours, others ten hours. If they do not reach that minimum they may be suspended. But a suspended student may apply for immediate reinstatement on probation; and many are so reinstated. At Colorado College no one is separated at the end of the first semester. A student who makes less than nine hours is on probation in the second semester, and a good many are separated at the end of the year.

With the exception of Pomona, the California institutions also are decidedly lax. At Occidental there is a rule that eight semester hours must be passed, but in practice very few are separated,—not more than one or two at the end of the first semester. Cali-

fornia, too, has the the eight-hour rule, but in the Colleges of Letters and Sciences only three or four are separated in each semester. Here, also, I found the peculiar custom of petitioning for immediate reinstatement.

At Reed College, in this matter as in all others, every student is treated strictly as an individual. There is no rule, and few are separated.

At Brown and Harvard, as at Yale and the western institutions, every case is treated individually. At both institutions the authorities are merciful, and many students are allowed to remain in college who have failed in a large part of their work.

At Brown most students who fail four courses and many who fail three out of a total of five are separated. Regarding the Harvard practice I found it difficult to obtain definite information. Few are separated at the end of the first half-year. At the end of the year a student may be "dropped" or his "connection with the college may be severed." In the latter case he may apply for readmission at the beginning of the next academic year; and many are thus immediately reinstated on the understanding that, if at any time their records are unsatisfactory, they will withdraw upon request. This is similar to the practice at Ohio State, Wisconsin, and California. In the year 1914-1915, twenty-two freshmen were dropped (out of a total of 661 new students); thirty-one had their connection severed and might apply for immediate readmission.

My observations have not convinced me that it would be wise for us to relax our system of discipline for low scholarship, even though I have listened to stories of students who were unable to do the work of freshman year and ultimately graduated with honors. An occasional individual will suffer, but the knowledge that three failures mean inevitable dismissal is an incentive so valuable to the general condition of the college that I should hesitate to recommend any change in attitude or practice that might weaken its effectiveness.

It must be said, however, that we should not take too much pride to ourselves because we send many students away. As Flexner says, "It is comparatively simple to extirpate those who appear to be the weaker brethren; but it is not a whit more intelligent than to pull every aching tooth." It may well be that the colleges that separate a much smaller proportion than we do have a higher standard than our own; that is, their methods may secure more work or better results. There is no doubt that our administrative officers do their work wisely and thoroughly on the basis of the results reported to them, but it is still a question whether we are doing all that is possible to stimulate the intellectual interest of our students.

I have found nowhere except at Pomona and, possibly, Oberlin a mechanism for the regulation of attendance so automatic as the Dartmouth system. Cut-systems are practically unknown in the west,—that is, there is no definite allowance of absences,—because it is assumed that students will attend college exercises as they have attended classes in school. In general this assumption is justified, and it is an indication of the difference between the east and the west in the attitude of students toward college.

In the west they speak of going to "school" when they mean college. They are more inclined to learn their lessons from day to day; it is my impression that a large proportion of failures in western colleges is due to poor preparation or natural inability, rather than to idleness or other interests. And students do, in general, attend their college exercises as a matter of course.

Even in the west, however, there are cases of excessive absence and there are rules,—but there are many exceptions; here again the individual is always considered. At the University of Denver the instructor gives zero for an absence unless the student brings an excuse from the office; for three unexcused absences he loses credit for the course. The University of Colorado had a cut system with an automatic penalty, loss of hours; but the whole system was abandoned and the dean now uses his discretion in the treatment of individual cases. The instructor hands in weekly reports to the secretary, who submits to the dean cases that need attention; the dean interviews each student, and possibly suspends him. As a matter of fact, however, there are very few cases and the penalty is rarely needed. At Colorado College the whole matter of absences is in the hands of the instructors, who have the power to refuse credit for a course.

At Stanford and California the situation is, at least from the eastern viewpoint, chaotic; and I doubt if even the attitude of the western student toward his college work justifies the total lack of system. At Stanford no record is kept at the office. Each department is supposed to have its own treatment of absences. But within the department individual instructors vary; some keep no record at all. At California attendance is graded, like scholarship, on a basis of one to five. Until recently no record was handed in until the end of the course. Now reports are made in the middle of the semester. If the instructor marks attendance as deficient (4) or a failure (5), the student is summoned by the dean and may be put on probation. In practice it appears that certain departments are very lax and it is admitted that some instructors keep no record of attendance whatever.

At Reed, where the western student attitude appears at its best, no record of absences is kept at the office, and it is said that students are practically never absent. The same condition holds at the University of Washington.

Pomona has the only cut system I have noted in a western college. The student is allowed as many absences as the number of semester hours he is taking. For sixteen excessive absences or a major fraction thereof, he must take an extra hour; and excessive absences accumulate from semester to semester. If in one course a student takes twice as many cuts as there are weekly exercises he must take an extra hour. And if he takes eight excessive absences from assembly (corresponding to our chapel, though all the exercises are not religious), he is suspended for one semester.

The general feeling in the central states is like that in the west,—that attendance is not a serious problem. There are no cut systems, except at Western Reserve, and rules are in most places loosely administered. This is the case especially at Wisconsin, where the matter is in the hands of the instructors and, as is almost inevitable under this arrangement, there is the greatest laxity. Some instructors admit that they keep no record. Excessive absence is rarely penalized. There is a tradition that, if a student is absent more than one-fifth of the exercises in a course, he must take a make-up examination. But as this is a penalty for the instructor as well as for the student (in fact it might be considered a privilege for the student) the instructor avoids it, if possible. At Chicago a student who has had excessive absences is summoned by the dean and, unless he offers satisfactory excuse, is reported to the instructor concerned. The latter assigns any penalty or none at all. At the University of Ohio the matter of attendance is in the hands of the departments. There is a rule that four consecutive absences must be reported at the office, but the rule is apparently not observed. There are no monitors and no record of absences at the office.

At Michigan and Minnesota the system is more strict, though by no means automatic. At Michigan there is an attendance committee to receive excuses, and theoretically every absence must be excused; it is admitted, however, that instructors are careless in the matter of reporting. There is no definite penalty for excessive absence, except that a student absent more than eighteen hours in a course loses the course. It may be said incidentally that in most of the large universities little absence is due to athletics and other outside activities. One reason is the fact that teams and clubs are drawn from the whole university and no one department is seriously affected. At Minnesota absences are reported at the office every day and excessive absences are treated by a faculty committee. The two stages of discipline are, first, a warning and then, if the absence continues, separation. At Oberlin, where student life is perhaps more carefully supervised than in any other college, it is not surprising to find strict regulation of attendance. The system is very simple: for every absence the student must give a satisfactory excuse at the office; if the excuse is not accepted, he is reported to the instructor, who gives zero for the absence.

Western Reserve has a cut system: four cuts are allowed in each course. But every absence must be made up and the instructor gives a zero until it is made up. There is no fixed penalty for overcutting. Theoretically, more than two unexcused absences in a course reduce the grade; but in practice the penalty is left to the discretion of the instructor, who may even drop a student from his course for excessive absence.

In the east all the institutions I have visited, except Harvard, have a cut system more or less strictly administered, and with various penalties for overcutting. At Columbia the system is a little more generous than at Dartmouth. Instructors keep the record; the office gets only the totals. The committee on instruction considers individual cases of excessive absence and decides whether the student shall be permitted to take the examination. If permitted, he must gain C or better in order to pass the course. But departments use their discretion, and there is much variation. At Princeton the number of allowed absences from the class-room exercises of a year has recently been reduced from 49 to 39. The penalty for excessive absences is an extra three hour course. Juniors and seniors in the first and second groups and candidates for final special honors are excused from compulsory attendance.

At Yale freshmen are allowed twelve cuts each semester; others, fifteen. They are cumulative from semester to semester. All allowed cuts may be taken in a single course, but an instructor may refuse credit to a man who, in his opinion, has had an excessive number of absences. When a student has taken fifteen absences, he receives a warning. If his absences continue he is put on probation and is required to take extra hours. In honor courses attendance is not compulsory.

At Williams the regular allowance is five per cent of the exercises in a course; for students of high rank, ten per cent. There is no automatic penalty except that a student who is absent half the number of exercises in a course loses the course. No cuts are allowed in the departments of English, elocution, and physical training. At Amherst five cuts are allowed in each semester course. There is some laxity, it appears, and there is no check upon instructors who neglect to hand in their records. For overcutting in a course a student's grade is reduced five units for each absence; for excessive overcutting he may lose credit for the course. The whole matter is in the hands of the dean.

The system at Brown is well planned and well administered. A student is allowed eighteen absences each semester; there are at least in theory no excuses for absences beyond this. If he has taken as many as twelve in the middle of the semester he receives a warning. If he takes more than eighteen in a semester he may have a smaller allowance for the next semester or may be forbidden to take any absence without excuse, under penalty of separation. If a student takes an excessive number in one course,

the instructor may report him to the attendance committee or may give zero for absences which he regards as excessive.

The system at Harvard is very lax and there is a great deal of absence. A good student may be absent a considerable part of the time without penalty of any sort. There is no cut system and no maximum allowance. A student who has been cutting a good deal may be called to the office and warned, or may be penalized by his instructors; but his treatment depends largely upon the quality of his college work.

In the matter of attendance the western attitude is decidedly worthy of consideration. In the east we have cut systems and definite penalties,—at Dartmouth a machinelike system perfectly administered,—and we have a good deal of absence, much of which is unnecessary. In the west there are no cut systems and such rules as exist are loosely administered or absolutely ignored,—and the amount of absence is almost negligible. Allowed cuts certainly tempt a student to neglect his work without cause and the combination cut-and-excuse system results in a good deal of absence.

It is apparent from conditions at Harvard that in the east we may not assume that students will attend their college exercises as a matter of course. More or less coercion, careful supervision, and definite penalties are evidently necessary. It would be an interesting experiment if some eastern college would abandon the cut system and require the student to attend all his college exercises unless excused by the proper authority.

Faculty Regulation of Student Activities

The two extremes in this matter are represented best, perhaps, by Yale and the University of Wisconsin. At Yale the faculty have practically nothing to do with student activities; there are no faculty members on the athletic council, and even the alumni members are appointed by the undergraduates. There is, moreover, no systematic supervision of non-athletic activities. At Wisconsin, on the other hand, faculty control is practically absolute. A university committee appointed by the president controls all student activities, athletic and otherwise. Recently one alumnus and one undergraduate have been added to this committee.

The University of Colorado has an athletic board consisting of three faculty members (one is chairman) and three undergraduates, but on most questions the chairman has two votes. On account of the exaggerated interest of the alumni it has been found best to eliminate them from the board. At Princeton the athletic council consists of three trustees, three members of the faculty, three alumni, and three undergraduates. This council has general charge of athletics, but a faculty committee has authority in questions of eligibility. Also at Western Reserve and at Minnesota a

faculty committee decides questions of eligibility, and the Minnesota committee controls athletic finances. The Minnesota committee has expelled students who have been convicted of falsehood regarding the taking of money for athletics. At Harvard Dean Briggs, chairman of the committee on the regulation of athletic sports, has power in questions of eligibility. At Ohio State the athletic council consists of five members of the university faculty, two alumni, and two undergraduates. Other institutions, so far as I have noted, have a system like that at Dartmouth,—a council consisting of faculty, alumni, and students, the faculty members having predominant power only in matters pertaining to scholarship and attendance.

In most places I find that non-athletic activities seem not to require much supervision. Princeton has a special faculty committee for this purpose. The faculty committee at Wisconsin controls all student activities. At Minnesota a committee consisting of two members of the faculty, two alumni, and seven students has general charge of all activities, though final authority rests with a faculty committee of five members. At California a council of faculty, alumni, and students controls all activities. In other places I have not noted any specific supervision of non-athletic interests. In fact, I gained the very definite impression that elsewhere non-athletic activities do not play so important a part in student life as they do at Dartmouth.

It is a universal rule that students on probation are not allowed to represent the college. In the matter of removal from an organization for deficient scholarship during a semester there is variation and the Dartmouth custom by comparison appears somewhat lax. At Amherst a student is not removed from a team unless he is reported as failing in three courses, but he is not allowed to return during the semester. At Williams students having two D's are removed and are not allowed to return during the semester. At Western Reserve a student is removed if at any time he is deficient in two subjects, or if he is reported deficient in the same subject for two consecutive weeks; and he may not return during the semester. At Chicago a student removed from an organization is not allowed to return in the same quarter. At Michigan, where the control of athletics is very strict, no one who has had a failure in the previous semester may represent the college.

In very few institutions have I found restriction of the number of organizations to which a student may belong or the offices he may hold. At Oberlin, Minnesota, and Colorado College there are point systems; that is, each activity is rated by points according to the time it is supposed to consume, and no student is permitted to carry more than a certain number of points. The restriction is, however, by no means severe. At Oberlin, for example, a student may play in one year football, basketball, and baseball. A similar system at Chicago has been abandoned. There is a point

system at Brown, but it is applied only to official positions,—managerships, etc.—in the various organizations. At Western Reserve membership in more than one organization or participation in more than two sports requires the permission of the executive committee. At Stanford no student may take part in more than one dramatic performance during a semester.

VI. Undergraduates

Self-Government

Under this head there are two points to be considered:—first, the composition of the governing body; secondly, its functions.

Dartmouth with a council composed entirely of seniors, a majority of whom are ex-officio members, stands practically alone. Only Princeton and Minnesota have a system of this sort, and at Minnesota the members are all elected. Elsewhere the council is much more representative and, whether for this reason or not, is in many places much more active and influential. The usual plan provides for one or two freshmen and a gradually increasing number from the upper classes. The presidents of the four classes are commonly members of the council. Rarely a member of the faculty is included. This is the case at the University of Colorado and at Colorado College. At Ohio State the president of the university has regular meetings with the council. At Stanford the chairman of the faculty committee on student affairs attends certain meetings of the student conference. At Williams the council has joint meetings with a faculty committee.

There are three things which may come within the powers of a student council:—first, general oversight of student affairs,—for example, class elections and contests, privileges, and customs; secondly, violations of the honor system; thirdly, general discipline and the assignment of penalties for misdemeanors. In the east the activity of the council is usually confined to the first of these three things. At Yale there is one council for the college and another for the scientific school, both composed of strong, representative men, whose recommendations are practically always adopted by the faculty. The council of the scientific school administers the honor system. To neither council has the discipline of the institution been formally entrusted, as is the case in some western colleges; but both councils appear to be active and useful.

Brown has no regular council for men; but the Cammarian Club, a self-perpetuating organization, seems to have functions similar to those of the Dartmouth Palaeopitus. The women's council, through recommendations to the dean of women, is virtually in control of disciplinary matters in the women's college. Harvard has a council which, except that it has representatives from all classes, is like Palaeopitus. Amherst has a council consisting of five seniors, three juniors, and one sophomore elected by

their respective classes. It has general supervision of athletics, the honor system, college customs, and undergraduate policy. At Princeton the council has the same general and somewhat vague functions as is the case in most of the New England colleges. The honor system is administered by a special committee, distinct from the council.

In the central states, as in the east, the student council is not an important factor in administration. At Western Reserve and Minnesota the council administers the honor system, but otherwise there seem to be no specific or important duties. At Wisconsin, on the other hand, the council has more power and a somewhat elaborate organization,—a legislative body called the conference and a court to which cases of discipline may be referred. The court has the power of suspension, subject to appeal to the faculty.

In the west students are very much interested in self-government; and in some institutions have acquired complete control in all matters of discipline. At Colorado College the student commission has conferences with the faculty and is entitled to be heard before legislation is passed affecting non-academic activities. With certain exceptions, it manages all such activities. The executive board of the commission has charge of the discipline of the college. At the University of Colorado the council has the power of suspension, subject to appeal to the president. At Stanford the conference consists of representatives from what is termed the "living groups;" that is, dormitories, fraternities, etc., and each representative is made responsible for his group. There is a meeting of the conference every two weeks and attendance is compulsory. There is, likewise, a judicial committee of the conference, called the council, which considers all cases of discipline and has power to assign the penalties of expulsion, suspension, probation, and extra hours, subject to the approval of a faculty committee.

At California the council (called the undergraduate student affairs committee) considers all cases of discipline and makes recommendation to the president of the university, who usually induces the student to accept the action of the committee without reference to the faculty. Confidence in the council is said to be constantly increasing. Reed College has a council of six members elected annually by vote of all the students. The council has charge of discipline and student affairs, including the honor system.

The Dartmouth Palaeopitus, compared with these western councils, is little more than an honorary organization. I have been rather favorably impressed with the results of the western system, and I am inclined to think that, if the Palaeopitus were somewhat differently constituted—especially if it included representatives from all classes—and were given more definite powers and responsibilities, it might be a greater help in the administration of the college, not only in matters of discipline, but also in the general spirit of the student body.

In those institutions in which the honor system is carefully administered, where students report cases of dishonesty and the penalty is severe, the system a success. I have found it in operation in about half the institutions visited.

In the Sheffield Scientific School it is administered by a committee of five students, containing at least three members chosen from and by the student council. Students report cases of dishonesty and the penalty of expulsion may be inflicted by a unanimous vote of the committee. It is agreed that the system is successful. The students of Yale College voted not to adopt the system, on the ground that they were unwilling to report fellow students.

At Amherst results are by no means so satisfactory. Students sign a statement to the effect that they have not given or received help during the examination. They do not report cases of dishonesty, though at the outset they agreed to do so. Information comes, therefore, only from members of the faculty. Cases are handled by a committee of students and the penalty is comparatively light,—suspension. The situation at Williams is much better. Students report cases of dishonesty to a student committee, which makes recommendation to the faculty. The penalty is more severe,—suspension for freshmen, expulsion for upperclassmen. As a matter of fact, the instructor is present at the examination a good deal of the time. Indeed, the students recently petitioned that he be required to be within reach during the whole examination in order to answer questions.

It is the general, though not unanimous, sentiment at Princeton that the system is a success. It is said that the most important result is the development of a sense of honor. Cases of dishonesty are reported by the students and handled by a student committee; the penalty is expulsion. There are several cases every year. The system at Princeton is rather more far-reaching than elsewhere; it is applied to every kind of work, including class quizzes, and a member of the Latin Department has applied it to the use of translations.

At Western Reserve there is disagreement as to the success of the system. Some instructors think there is much dishonesty, and one man who spoke highly of the system admitted that if a student sees another cheating he is more likely to warn him than to report him. At Oberlin reports are made by students to a court appointed by the student senate. Expulsion is the penalty for serious cases; suspension or reprimand for those less serious. Results are said to be entirely satisfactory. At Minnesota the system appears to be working fairly well, though certain officers of the university speak of it very doubtfully. There are five or six cases of dishonesty a year in final examinations. In serious cases the penalty is suspension for one or more years, but students suspended for this cause

rarely return to college; in less serious cases the student loses credit for the course. The system is applied to all written work, but is not used in freshman courses.

At Occidental, Reed, and Washington, results are said to have been entirely satisfactory. At Stanford and California, on the other hand, the honor system appears at its worst. At California, by the way, it is called *honor spirit,* not the honor system; and, in fact, at neither place is it sufficiently organized to be called a system. Departments or individual instructors use their discretion in the matter of leaving the examination room. There is no pledge and students refuse to report one another. At Stanford it is the duty of members of the conference (the student council) to report or warn students whom they see cheating. They are required to report a second offense. In both places the penalty is very light,—loss of credit in the course for the first offense. Dishonesty is common and few cases are reported. Students at Stanford admit that, in some courses, there are epidemics of cheating. They offer the *naive* excuse that, since some instructors remain in the room and others do not, they do not regard the honor system as definitely established. There was a thorough investigation last year and no doubt conditions have already been improved.

It is apparent that the honor system cannot be operated successfully unless students agree to report one another and carry out their agreement in all cases, regardless of personal or social considerations. In places where it works well they tell of students who have reported members of the same fraternity. Moreover, the penalty for dishonesty must be severe,—nothing short of expulsion. A system that tolerates the first offense or allows it to go with a warning or a reprimand is very likely to become a *dishonor system.*

At two other institutions, Ohio State and Wisconsin, though the honor system nominally does not exist, instructors may leave their examination rooms if they wish. Practically, the situation is like that at Stanford and California. At Wisconsin conditions appear to be pretty bad. The only penalty for dishonesty is the loss of a few hours. At Chicago, though the honor system is not in use, cases of dishonesty are reported to a student committee which may make recommendation to the faculty. The penalty is light: for the first offense, loss of credit in the course.

Where the honor system is not in use, the conduct of examinations is usually left to the various departments; that is, instructors are made responsible for their own examinations. Nowhere except at Harvard—where graduate students serve as proctors—have I found a proctoring system operated entirely from the office, as at Dartmouth; or an examination schedule managed in such a businesslike way and with so few cases of dishonesty. It seems to me that it is as near perfection as any part of our administrative system. Regarding the honor system I am inclined to agree with Dean

Briggs that "it ministers to a mistaken sensitiveness, endangers the authenticity of the college degree, and imposes on the conscientious student a duty he is better off without."

The Attitude of Students toward their College Work

If we may rely upon the memory and judgment of instructors who have gone from Dartmouth to other institutions, we have no reason to congratulate ourselves upon the attitude of our students toward the requirements of the College. Almost everywhere—even in New England—when I asked a man to compare Dartmouth students with others, I received the reply, "The students here are more serious;" or, "They learn their lessons better."

I give these criticisms for what they may be worth, without undertaking to express an opinion as to the justice of them. It is not surprising to hear such statements in the central states or in the west. As I have already said, most of the students in those parts of the country not only attend classes but learn lessons as a matter of course. There are just as many—perhaps more—poorly prepared, but there are by no means so many who persistently neglect their work or are satisfied with a passing mark. I got an interesting criticism at Minnesota, to the effect that students there were not so mature as in the east, that they lacked originality and power of independent thought, but were more serious-minded and learned their lessons better.

Reed College offers the best illustration of the western attitude. I was particularly impressed by the fact that at that institution, when an instructor does not appear, a student is chosen to preside and the class goes on just the same. Once when the whole faculty had to go away to a meeting lasting three days, the work of the college was carried on in this way without interruption.

In 1902 the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences voted: "That a committee be appointed to inquire and report what further measures may be advantageously taken to improve the quality of the work done in satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts." This committee made the surprising discovery that the average amount of work done by an undergraduate in a course was less than three and a half hours a week outside of the class-room. That is, the average undergraduate was working in all less than twenty-six hours a week. The committee recently appointed at Chicago, primarily for the standardization of courses, will undoubtedly proceed along the same line as the Harvard committee. A similar investigation at Dartmouth might produce some interesting results.

Fraternities and Clubs

In several places I have heard the complaint that fraternities exercise a bad influence upon either the intellectual or the social life of the college community. This criticism was made most

emphatically perhaps at Yale (the Scientific School), Williams, Ohio State, and California. On the other hand the senior societies at Yale seem to exert a particularly good influence. It is a well-known fact that men are elected to these societies who have accomplished something; not merely because they are good fellows. It is also true that they show a high regard for literary ability and achievement and will not consider a man who drinks to excess or is morally objectionable. The ambition to become a member of one of these societies has done much for college spirit at Yale. I should mention also the very successful Elizabethan Club at Yale, a club for men of intellectual interests, and an interesting parallel to our new organization, The Arts.

Fraternity conditions at Brown seem to be excellent. There are many alumni in Providence who endeavor to keep up the standard of scholarship in their fraternities. One alumnus has given a cup for the fraternity making the best record.

At California there has recently been a great improvement in this matter, due to the efforts of the fraternities themselves. The average standing of fraternity members is now higher than that of non-fraternity men. An interesting plan has been put into operation which provides for fellowships, one to be maintained by each fraternity, the incumbent to receive board and room and, in return, to do some tutoring for his fellow members and, in general, to act as the representative of the fraternity in relations with the faculty.

We might learn something, I think, from fraternity rules at Stanford. After dinner in one fraternity house I noticed that members who had been playing and singing disappeared at 7.30, and was told that it was the rule that there should be no music after that hour, and that freshmen were required to study in the evening. The same rule, I found, was in force in other houses, and also the rule that there should be no card playing except between Friday noon and Saturday night. Fraternity upperclassmen make their freshmen mix with others and there is no discrimination against non-fraternity men. The Union (like our College Club) is a real club for everyone including members of the faculty.

At Wisconsin, on the other hand, conditions seem to be rather bad. Only comparatively rich men can belong to fraternities. Non-fraternity men are waiters in fraternity houses and, in general, there is a sharp distinction between fraternity and non-fraternity men. Strangely enough, however, in general student affairs the non-fraternity men, through the student council, have the upper hand. They do not allow the fraternities to give house-parties and, it is said, were recently considering the prohibition of evening clothes.

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA

VII. Miscellaneous

I may note finally a few points which seem to deserve consideration and have not found a place under more specific headings.

In several institutions it is the custom to have frequent informal faculty meetings in the faculty club house for the discussion of college business. I attended such a meeting at Columbia and another at Stanford. In both cases someone had been appointed to open the subject and the discussion was general and interesting. At Columbia it is the custom for this informal meeting to make recommendations to the faculty, and, as the two bodies are identical, the informal meeting may do a good deal of business. At Stanford, though no vote was taken, it was practically decided at the meeting I attended to adopt the four-quarter year. At the University of Washington similar informal meetings are held, not limited, however, to the discussion of academic subjects. We have had a few meetings of this sort at Dartmouth, but it occurred to me that we might make rather more of them than we do.

I was struck also with the possibilities of the Columbia forum, an occasional meeting of students and faculty for the free discussion of matters of current college interest. There is a similar device at California, the University Meeting, as it is called. President Wheeler speaks highly of this meeting as a means of developing civic consciousness.

It was something of a surprise to find that the preceptorial system at Princeton had dwindled until it is now applied almost exclusively to advanced English courses and the studies of the social science group. Not only was it very expensive, but it was found to be superfluous in courses with many sections and in advanced courses with few students. So, as preceptors went away, their places were not filled. The system is now on a sound basis, and it is thought that it will survive in its present form.

There is a growing college interest, I think, in the development of intramural sports, due partly to a reaction against the exaggerations of intercollegiate sports. Reed College is a good example of what may be done where intercollegiate sports are forbidden. There is an intense interest in inter-class games of all sorts; everyone seems to take part in some kind of game; and the whole situation seemed to me very healthy. The faculty at Western Reserve has been giving much attention to this subject. At Princeton, since 1910 the intracollegiate athletic association has been a formal organization having fourteen different sports under its supervision. As the president says, in his report for 1915, this organization is unique. The success of the work, he says, is shown by the crowds of men who frequent the gymnasium, the tennis courts (there are twenty-eight and there should be twice as many), the lake and the baseball fields, to take part in practice or contests for the various championships. In 1914-1915 there were 842 men on non-varsity

teams. At Harvard much attention is being given to freshman sports, especially to freshman interdormitory games. Moreover, fifty-three tennis courts are in constant use. In this phase of college life we are not keeping up with other institutions. The Outing Club provides certain forms of exercise in the winter, but several additional handball courts would be of great benefit and funds, if available, could probably not be spent to greater advantage than in the construction of additional tennis courts.

In many places I have found a system of extension courses and what may be called extension lectures. Even in Massachusetts such lectures are given by members of the various college faculties, the expense, in some cases at least, being defrayed in one way or another by the communities where the courses are given. It has occurred to me that the Dartmouth faculty might do some work of this sort outside of Hanover, to the advantage of the College as well as to that of the communities where such lectures might be given. I find that college teachers regard the payment for these lectures as a very welcome addition to their incomes. Moreover, there is no reason to assume that there would not be as much demand for lectures of this sort in New Hampshire as in other states. I feel strongly that there is an opportunity here for Dartmouth to prove her usefulness to the state, and I would suggest the appointment of a committee—possibly of trustees and members of the faculty—to consider the advisability of such a plan and the possible methods of its operation.

I wish to express to the trustees my sincere gratitude for the opportunity they have given me to undertake this investigation; to me personally it has been a work of great interest and value.

Respectfully submitted,

H. E. Burton.

Dartmouth College, October, 1916.

GAYLAMOUNT
PAMPHLET BINDER
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

C006063138

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

24Sep'52FS
24Sep'52ES
IGLE (N)
JAN 20 1959
SEP 16 1952 LU
JAN 2 1968
8Oct52PB
SEP 3
RECEIVED
8Sep'54RB
DEC 20'67 -9 AM
OCT 21 1954 LU
LOAN DEPT.
13Aug'56PT
REC'D LD
MAY 05 1989
AUG 13 1956
AUTO DISC. SEP 02 '88
23Nov'58DR

LD 21-95m-11,'50(2877s16)476